



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CLASSICAL NOTES

I. LUCIAN AND THE GOVERNOR OF CAPPADOCIA

In the story of Lucian's relations with Alexander, the false prophet, this statement is made: (*Alexander* 55) ἐπηγόμην δὲ καὶ στρατιώτας δύο, λογχοφόρον καὶ κοντοφόρον, παρὰ τοῦ ἡγουμένου τῆς Καππαδοκίας, φίλου δντος, λαβών, ὥς με παραπέμψειαν ἄχρι πρὸς τὴν θάλατταν. This governor of Cappadocia, in the opinion of W. von Christ, was Arrian, the historian, and Christ uses the passage to show that Lucian and Arrian were acquainted.¹ Such a use of the passage is quite impossible, as can be readily shown. In the first place Arrian's term in Cappadocia ended in the year 137.² At that time Lucian was probably under 20 years of age.³ But the Lucian of this episode was certainly a mature man, not a boy. In the second place it is generally agreed that the heyday of the imposter Alexander was in a period after 150. Riess⁴ dates him about 150 to 170. Arrian then is of course not the governor whom Lucian mentions as a friend.⁵

It may, however, be possible to identify this governor if this episode in Lucian's life can be dated a little more definitely within the period 150 to 170. An examination of this sketch of Lucian's, the *Alexander*, with a view to datable incidents, yields the following. A Severianus is mentioned (cap. 27) who, on the advice of Alexander's oracle, so Lucian says, invaded Armenia and was badly defeated. This is an historical event which, we know, took place in 160–161 or perhaps early in 162.⁶ Again, Lucian says (cap. 58) that at the instigation of Alexander the name of the city where he lived was changed to Ionopolis. It is known from coins that this change was made in the period 161–169.⁷ We are told furthermore (cap. 36) of Alexander's claim that he could cure cases of the plague. This plague began in 166.⁸ Again some events are mentioned (cap. 48) which took place at the beginning of Marcus Aurelius' wars with the Germans, late in 166.⁹ The dates of these events, which are found mentioned in the various chapters of the sketch, would seem

¹ Müller *H. Buch* VII, II, 2 (1913), p. 583, n. 5; cf. n. 2.

² P.—W. 2, 1230 ff. *Prosop. Imp. Rom.* I, 243.

³ Lucian was born about 120. See Christ, *op. cit.*, p. 550.

⁴ P.—W. 1, 1444, no. 70.

⁵ See Nissen, *Rh. M.* XLIII (1888), p. 241.

⁶ E. Ritterling, *Rh. M.* LIX (1904), p. 186.

⁷ Babelon, *R. N.* (1900), p. 15.

⁸ Niese in Müller *H. Buch* III, 5, p. 339.

⁹ P.—W. 3, 1850.

to indicate that Alexander was especially famous in the sixties of the second century.

Other indications lead to the same conclusion. After relating the affair of Severianus (mentioned above) and some similar incidents, Lucian says that all these happened within the bounds of Asia Minor (cap. 30), and that after that Alexander's fame spread to Rome itself. Too much is not to be expected of Lucian in the way of a chronological order of events; but this at least would seem a clear proof that Alexander became widely known only after 160. It was after 160 then that a certain Rutilianus, at Rome, heard of Alexander, came under his influence, and ultimately married his daughter (cap. 30-35). Just after this follows the mention of the plague of 166, with a pretty clear indication that the order is chronological (cap. 36). The marriage referred to evidently took place between 160 and 166.¹⁰ Lucian tells us furthermore that Rutilianus was a man of 60 at the time (cap. 35), and of experience in many official positions (cap. 30), and that he died at the age of 70.

The information to be derived from an inscription which was put up in honor of Rutilianus agrees very nicely with the evidence from Lucian. This inscription (*C. I. L.* XIV, 3601) proves that Rutilianus had held many official positions, notably the governorship of Moesia in 158-160, or about 166 (cap. 48), and the proconsulship of Asia in 172.¹¹ This position in Asia, or a similar one in Africa, was regularly the last and most honored office of the senatorial career. It was naturally held by a man of years. From the time of this position, 172, we can figure back to a date not before 162 for the marriage of Rutilianus, since he died about ten years after his marriage. And since the marriage probably took place before 166, as has been shown, his death must have occurred by about the year 176.¹² These figures are obtained without insisting too strictly on the exactness of Lucian's statements about Rutilianus' age.

Now Rutilianus was indirectly concerned in Lucian's encounter with Alexander. After describing how he barely escaped death by the wiles of the faker, Lucian says: (cap. 57) "I even thought of bringing suit against him—but the governor of Bithynia and Pontus,

¹⁰ Fr. Cumont (in *Mem. Cour. par l'Acad. Roy. Belgique* XL (1887), *Alexandre d'Abonothchos*, p. 48 ff.) claims 165 as the date.

¹¹ Stout, *Govs. of Moesia*, p. 25-26. Rat and Bayet, *Les Curatores Viarum* in *R. E. A. II* (1914), p. 65 ff.

¹² Cf. Cumont, *op. cit.*, p. 52.

Avitus (?),¹³ begged and prayed me to give it up, for, on account of his regard for Rutilianus, he could not, he said, punish the man even if he caught him in a criminal action." From this statement it is evident that very close relations must have existed between Alexander and Rutilianus. It seems very proper to infer that Rutilianus had married the daughter of Alexander by the time of this episode. Hence the episode is to be dated after 162, in all probability. At all events the date must be after 160, for only after that year did Rutilianus become acquainted with Alexander. Near the end of the sketch we find that Rutilianus was still alive after the death of Alexander (cap. 60). Since Rutilianus himself died about the year 176, it is plain that the episode which we are dating must have occurred considerably earlier than that year. Evidently it is to be dated well within the period 160 to 176.¹⁴ This conclusion agrees very nicely with the evidence first given to show that Alexander was widely known in the sixties, and with the fact, evident throughout the sketch, that Lucian was a mature man at the time.

We are now in a position to solve the problem of the identity of the governor of Cappadocia and friend of Lucian who gave Lucian an escort of soldiers. From about the year 160 to the middle of 175 and even later the list of governors is probably complete. The first is Severianus, who was so badly defeated in Armenia not later than the spring of 162. He can hardly be the man. In the first place his term is too early. In the second place Lucian describes him (cap. 27) as "that fool Gaul," a term hardly applicable to a friend. His successor, in all probability, was Statius Priscus, who successfully continued the war in Armenia in 163 following.¹⁵ This man might very well be Lucian's friend. But it must be noted that his term was taken up by this very serious war, which in fact was the immediate cause of his appointment to Cappadocia. It is hardly possible that he had any time to think of Lucian's convenience, and it is not at all likely that he had any soldiers to spare for an escort especially through Roman territory. His successor may have been

¹³ Jacobitz reads *Αὔειρος* for the MSS *αὐτὸς*. I do not think therefore that my argument can be based on this reading. If it is correct however, we learn that this incident occurred between 161 and 169 probably, for within this period Avitus was governor of Bithynia. (*Dig. Just. L. 2, 3, 2.*) In particular Avitus is known from an inscription to have been governor in 165. See G. Hirschfeld in *Sitzber. der Akad.* (1888), p. 875.

¹⁴ This terminus *ante quem* may be placed a year or two earlier. Lucian mentions (cap. 57) Eupator as king of Bosphoros at the time of this incident. This king's reign was over by 174-175 at the latest. See P.—W. 3, 1, 784. Head, *Hist. Num.* p. 504. Croiset definitely dates the incident in 164; Cumont, in 167 or 168. See below, n. 17.

¹⁵ Harrer, *Studies in Syria*, p. 33. Stout, *Govs. of Moesia*, p. 27.

C. Iulius Severus.¹⁶ The identification of this man with Lucian's friend is open to the same objections as in the case of Priscus.¹⁷ Very probably P. Martius Verus succeeded Priscus, or possibly Severus, in the latter part of 166, at the close of the war. He remained as governor into the year 175 when he was succeeded by C. Arrius Antoninus.¹⁸ The term of Antoninus is too late to allow any claim on his behalf as Lucian's friend.¹⁹ Martius Verus is then probably the friend of Lucian. Verus was a famous consular of the time of the Antonines. He was twice consul, and while governor of Cappadocia he loyally supported Marcus Aurelius against the uprising of the great general Avidius Cassius. By this identification we gain a new detail in our information about Lucian's life and acquaintances.

II. "COHORS I FLAVIA BESSORUM QUAE EST IN MACEDONIA"

Two military diplomas (official records of grants of Roman citizenship with honorable discharge of soldiers) alone make mention of a *Cohors I Flavia Bessorum*. Of these two, one,²⁰ which is dated in the year 100 A.D., shows the presence of the cohort in Moesia Superior; the other,²¹ dated in the year 120, states that a cohort which has exactly the same titles was located in Macedonia. That these diplomas refer to one and the same cohort seems certain. In the first place the identity of all three elements in the titles of the cohorts indicates that the cohorts are identical.²² In the second

¹⁶ v. Premerstein in *Klio* XIII (1913), p. 89, and n. 3. *C. I. L.* III, 7505.

¹⁷ M. Croiset (*Essai sur—Lucien* (1882), p. 17 ff.) notes that Lucian was at Antioch in 162 or 163, and at Corinth at the end of 164 or early in 165. (This date is derived from information given in *The Way to Write History*, see caps. 5, 14, 17, and 30. The year 166, at the end of the Parthian War, is probably more accurate. P.—W. 3, 1847. Certainly the date must be before the beginning of the Germanic wars, late in 166. See cap. 5, and P.—W. 3, 1850). He concludes that the adventure with Alexander occurred in the interval, probably in 164. By this method of reckoning, a date in 165 or the first half of 166 would be just as possible. If this view of Croisets' is true, then of course we must probably identify Statius Priscus, or possibly Iulius Severus, with Lucian's friend. But, as I have shown there is serious objection to such an identification. Fr. Cumont, *op. cit.*, p. 51, differing from Croiset, would have it that Lucian made another trip in which he visited Alexander in 167 or 168. This dating seems more probable.

¹⁸ Harrer, *op. cit.*, pp. 37 and 91.

¹⁹ See n. 14.

²⁰ *L'Année Épigraphique* (1912), 128. See also *Bulletino della Comm. Archeol. Comun. di Roma* (1912), p. 280. The exact date of the diploma is May 8, 100.

²¹ *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscr. et Belles-Lettres* (1909), pp. 130-134. The exact date of the diploma is June 29, 120. Dessau, *Inscr. Lat. Sel.* III, 1, p. 466 in the index, refers to *Cohors I Flavia Bessorum* under nos. 9054 and 9055. These numbers will no doubt present the two military diplomas, but the volume containing them has not yet appeared.

²² The identity of cohorts whose titles are the same cannot be taken for granted, especially when the titles consist merely of the number and the name of the tribe from which the cohort was originally enrolled. Where three elements of the title are given there is little probability of error in assuming

place the provinces, Moesia Superior and Macedonia, in which these troops were stationed, bordered on one another; and it is quite possible that the cohort had been transferred from Moesia, to which the earlier inscription refers, to Macedonia. Again it is to be noted that the wife of the infantryman in *I Flavia Bessorum*, whose grant of citizenship is recorded in the Macedonian diploma, was a native of Tricornium, which was in Moesia Superior not far from the great military center at Viminacium.²³ Their children are also mentioned in the grant. From these facts one would infer that the soldier had been stationed in Moesia Superior some years before, about the time of the presence of *I Flavia Bessorum* as indicated in the Moesian diploma. The two cohorts are then, in all probability, identical.

A word may be said in regard to the station of this cohort and its history in Moesia Superior. It has been remarked that the wife of the soldier in the Macedonian diploma was a native of Tricornium, near Viminacium, on the Danube. At Tricornium too the Macedonian diploma was discovered.²⁴ One may surmise that the veteran and his family had returned to the old quarters and had settled in a garrison town close by the regular station of the cohort. The military situation at the time of the Moesian diploma makes it reasonable to suppose that practically all the forces in the province would be stationed on the border. At the end of the first century and the beginning of the second, the task of protecting properly the Danube frontier was no light one, as Moesia was in direct contact with Dacia, the scene of the activities of Decebalus. There is listed in the Moesian diploma of May, 100, in Moesia Superior alone an auxiliary force of 3 *alae* and 21 cohorts—a force considerably larger than the regular garrison of the province.²⁵ This force, we may be sure, was being concentrated for the Dacian War which actually began in

identity, although even then there may be room for doubt. See G. L. Cheesman, *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*, Oxford, 1914, p. 59; and Cichorius in Pauly-Wissowa 4, Sp. 231 ff. and Sp. 285.

²³ Forbiger, *Hbuch Geogr.* 3, 747. There are two diplomas, whose evidence is complete and certain, which show that the locality from which the discharged soldier's wife came was in the province where the troop served. D.XXIII mentions a cohort stationed in Dalmatia, and the wife of a soldier of the cohort as a native of Dalmatia. D.XXXIX gives similar evidence of the wife of a soldier in an *ala* stationed in Pannonia Inferior. D.XXXV shows that a Sequanian woman was wife of a soldier in an *ala* stationed in Raetia.

²⁴ See ref. in note 2.

²⁵ D. CIII, of 93 A.D., lists 3 *alae* and 9 cohorts in Moesia Superior. See also note 10 below. Cheesman, *op. cit.*, p. 155, lists in Moesia Superior, for the reign of Hadrian and of Antoninus Pius, an auxiliary force of 1 *ala* and 7 cohorts. (Cheesman incorrectly accepts, from *L'Année épigraphique*, 103 as the date of the diploma).

less than a year from the date of the diploma.²⁶ The *Cohors I Flavia Bessorum* was one unit in this force, and the suggestion lies on the surface that it played a part in the war. There is some evidence to show that the cohort was not stationed in Moesia Superior for very long before the year 100. A diploma,²⁷ dated in 93, names 3 alae and 9 cohorts, which possibly formed the entire auxiliary army of Moesia Superior.²⁸ All of these troops without exception are also included in the diploma of 100; but the *Cohors I Flavia Bessorum* is not among them. The absence of its name from the list does not necessarily mean that it was not in Moesia Superior at the time, for Mommsen has shown that the list of troops given in a military diploma is by no means always complete for the province.²⁹ It seems that, at times, a diploma was issued to a group of auxiliary troops serving with a legion. Even if that were so in the case of the diploma of 93, the diploma of 100 was evidently issued to the same group with additions, one of which was the Bessian cohort. Now an examination of the previous history of the other eleven cohorts in the diploma of 100, which do not appear in that of 93, shows that six of them were in other provinces not many years before.³⁰ Of these six, two were stationed in Pannonia as late as the year 98.³¹ In the case of the remaining five cohorts evidence is lacking. There is no evidence at all however for the presence of any of them in Moesia Superior previous to 100. It seems very possible then, or even probable, that the Bessian cohort was brought into the province between 93 and 100, and perhaps just before the outbreak of the Dacian War. That for some time after 100 it was stationed in the province seems evident.³²

The evidence that the cohort was located in Macedonia in June, 120, is perfectly definite. It is stated in the diploma: . . . *peditibus qui militaverunt in Coh I Flavia Bessor. quae est in Macedonia sub Octavio Antonino quinque et viginti stipendiis emeritis*. . . .³³ This statement is remarkable, for Macedonia was a senatorial pro-

²⁶ Schiller, *Gesch. der Röm. Kzeit* I, p. 550. v. Domaszewski, *Gesch. der Röm. Kaiser* II, p. 174

²⁷ D. CIII, Sep. 16, 93. See note 6.

²⁸ See note 6 for the garrison in the second century.

²⁹ C. I. L. III, p. 2023.

³⁰ See Cichorius, *op. cit.* Sp. 259 ff. It is interesting to notice that some of these cohorts, brought into Moesia just before the war, were used to garrison Dacia, after sharing doubtless in the subjugation of it.

³¹ Cichorius, *op. cit.* Sp. 312 and 317.

³² See the remarks made above concerning the two diplomas which mention this cohort, and the discharged soldier of the Macedonian diploma.

³³ See ref. in note 2.

vince, and in such provinces no regular troops were stationed. The existing evidence of their presence in other senatorial provinces yields no parallel case. This evidence has been repeatedly studied and needs no repetition here.³⁴ For the present problem however it may be of some interest to notice that there are three cohorts which have, in addition to the title indicating the land where they were enrolled, the name of *Macedonica* or *Cyrenaica*. These names, according to Cichorius,³⁵ denote that the cohorts were at one time stationed in the province whose name they bear. The *Cohors II Gallorum Macedonica* is known to have served in 93 and 100 in Moesia Superior, and in Dacia in 110 and later.³⁶ The title *Macedonica* was evidently received before 93, and it may be that it was received during the period 15 to 44 A.D., when Macedonia was joined with Moesia under imperial governors.³⁷ The *Cohors I Lusitanorum Cyrenaica* was in Moesia Inferior in 99 and 105 and later.³⁸ The *Cohors II Hispanorum Scutata Cyrenaica* was in Dacia in the reign of Antoninus Pius.³⁹ Crete and Cyrene formed always, so far as we know, a senatorial province. Under what conditions and during what times these cohorts served there we have no means of knowing.⁴⁰ It is well known that in Africa during the early part of the first century there were troops under the senatorial governor; but this situation has always been considered unique and was discontinued long before the period in which the Macedonian diploma falls.⁴¹ Excluding the exceptional case of the troops in Africa, and the uncertain matter of the three cohorts which have been discussed, *Cohors I Flavia Bessorum* is the only body of regular troops known to have been stationed in a senatorial province. The possibility that Macedonia was at that time an imperial province naturally suggests itself.

It is interesting to make a comparison of the form of the unique Macedonian diploma with that of the other diplomas, all of which (there are considerably over 100) deal with troops commanded by imperial officials. The Macedonian diploma is found to be regular

³⁴ Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, 3rd ed., II, p. 263 ff., C. Halgan, *De L'Administration des Provinces Senatoriales*, Paris, 1898, p. 259 ff., Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung* II, p. 534 ff., Cichorius, *op. cit.* Sp. 314, on *Cohors Maritima*; Sp. 260, on *Cohors VII Breucorum* in Cyprus.

³⁵ *Op. cit.* Sp. 233, 2. Cheesman, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

³⁶ Cichorius, *op. cit.* Sp. 288.

³⁷ Stout, *Govs. of Moesia*, Princeton, 1911, pp. 3 and 7.

³⁸ Cheesman, *op. cit.*, p. 156. Cichorius, *op. cit.* Sp. 312.

³⁹ Cichorius, *op. cit.* Sp. 299.

⁴⁰ Halgan, *op. cit.*, p. 277, claims that the legion III Cyrenaica was once stationed in the province.

v. Domaszewski, *Rangordnung*, p. 176, lists it in Egypt.

⁴¹ Cagnat, *L'Armée Romaine d'Afrique*, Paris, 1913, I, p. 122.

in all respects. The cohort served *in Macedonia sub Octavio Antonino*. In this form regularly the diplomas state the name of the imperial governor.⁴² But it would be indeed extraordinary, at the time at which the diploma is dated, the reign of Hadrian, to find an official document listing an imperial cohort as under the command of (*sub*) a proconsul of a senatorial province.⁴³ From this consideration, and from the fact that the diploma is in every respect an imperial diploma in form, it is hard to escape the conclusion that Octavius Antoninus was an imperial governor.⁴⁴ Macedonia had apparently been placed temporarily under the emperor's direct control. A good precedent, in case the emperor wanted a precedent, could have been found in the history of Macedonia itself under the Romans.⁴⁵ Along with Achaia it formed a part of the province of Moesia from 15 to 44 A.D.⁴⁶ From the form of the diploma, which was issued to the one cohort only, it does not seem likely that Macedonia was joined with another province at this time. If it had been under the Moesian governor's supervision, any diploma issued would have listed very probably a number of cohorts. In fact the two other diplomas, which only mention one single cohort, refer to provinces where one cohort alone was stationed.⁴⁷ It is true, to be sure, that the cohort in Macedonia was drawn from the forces of Moesia Superior; but that fact cannot create a presumption that Macedonia was under the control of Moesia Superior, for of the three imperial provinces, which bordered on Macedonia, Thrace, Moesia Superior, and Dalmatia, Moesia Superior alone could spare a cohort without very materially weakening its forces.⁴⁸ It is unfortunate that nothing further is

⁴² The possibility that the phrase *sub Octavio Antonino* mentions the immediate cohort commander and not the governor is positively excluded by the fact that the name of the cohort commander is given near the end of the diploma in the usual form. There are two other diplomas issued to a single cohort which was the entire military force of the particular province. D.LXXVI, of the year 178, mentions the cohort *quae est Lyciae Pamphyliae sub Licinio Prisco leg. Iulio Festo tribuno*. A diploma published in *Rev. Etudes Anciennes* XVI (1914), pp. 290-295, dated in 192, mentions the cohort *quae est Lugduni sub Numisio Clemente tribuno*. These two differ from each other a little, and from the regular form. It does not seem that any solution for the problem on hand can be drawn from these differences.

⁴³ Of course the case of proconsular Africa in the first half of the first century cannot be used as a parallel case for this period. See above, and notes 15 and 22.

⁴⁴ Stech, *Senatores Romani*, Leipzig, 1912, p. 114, simply lists Octavius Antoninus as a proconsul *ut videtur* of Macedonia; so Dessau, *op. cit.* III, 1, index, p. 402. Hirschfeld, *Die Kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten*, Berlin, 1905, p. 55, n. 4, mentions a Terentius Gensianus, *censitor* of Macedonia in Hadrian's reign, as the first example of an imperial *censitor* in a senatorial province. Possibly there is rather evidence here that Macedonia was imperial at some time under Hadrian.

⁴⁵ Many cases are known of the temporary transference of a province from senatorial to imperial government. Pontus and Bithynia, under Pliny in Trajan's reign, is a well-known case.

⁴⁶ See above, and note 18.

⁴⁷ See above note 23, and references.

⁴⁸ Cheesman, *op. cit.*, p. 155, lists 3 cohorts in Dalmatia, but no legion, while in Moesia Superior there were 7 cohorts and 2 legions. There is no evidence for any force in Thrace.

known about the career of Octavius Antoninus, whose *cursus honorum* would possibly clear up this point.

We know nothing of the conditions which caused this change in Macedonia from senatorial to imperial government. There were many disturbances in many parts of the empire at the end of Trajan's reign and the beginning of Hadrian's. Dangerous revolts and foreign troubles had to be settled.⁴⁹ In 117-118 Hadrian came in person to this region where, in Dacia and the Pannonias, he placed Marcius Turbo in extraordinary command.⁵⁰ Possibly he found reason at this time to alter temporarily the government of Macedonia.⁵¹ Direct evidence shows merely that around the year 115⁵² there was proconsular government in Macedonia, and again sometime in the reign of Hadrian.⁵³

III. A NOTE ON JUSTIN MARTYR, DIALOGUE WITH TRYPHO LXXVIII, 10

Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho cap. LXXVIII, 10 reads: *ὅτι δὲ Δαμασκὸς τῆς ἀρραβικῆς γῆς ἦν καὶ ἔστιν, εἰ καὶ νῦν προσενέμεται τῇ Συροφονικῇ λεγομένῃ, οὐδ' ὑμῶν τινες ἀρνήσασθαι δύνανται.* The composition of the Dialogue is assigned by scholars to a period between 155 and 161 A.D., or at the latest 165-167, the time of the death of Justin,⁵⁴ and its dramatic date is about the year 135;⁵⁵ but the province of Syrophenicia or Syria Phoenice, in which Damascus was situated, was not in existence before the year 194.⁵⁶ The Dialogue's assignment of Damascus to Syrophenicia will therefore bear examination.

One suggestion only has been advanced in explanation of this apparent anachronism. Kuhn⁵⁷ and Marquardt⁵⁸ state that Syro-

⁴⁹ *Vita Hadriani*, 5-7.

⁵⁰ Schiller, *op. cit.* I, p. 610 ff. v. Premerstein, *Das Attentat der Konsulare auf Hadrian*, Leipzig, 1908, p. 17 ff.

⁵¹ If stories of Apuleius and Lucian represent true conditions at all, at about this time parts of Macedonia were infested with robber bands. Possibly they became so large that they were a real menace to the province, and caused its transference to imperial control to root them out. See Lucian, *Asinus* 16 ff., and 26; Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* III, 28 ff., and VI, 25.

⁵² *C. I. L.* III, 2830; cf. III, II, p. LIX. The *cursus honorum* given in this inscription mentions the quaestorship of Macedonia for around the year 115. Dessau 1054 also shows Macedonia under senatorial rule about 115.

⁵³ *C. I. L.* III, 586 gives the name of a proconsul of Macedonia in the reign of Hadrian. Unfortunately there is no means for dating the term more exactly.

⁵⁴ G. Archambault, *Justin Dialogue avec Tryphon* vol. I, introd. p. LXXXIV. Christ, *Gk. Lit.* in Müller *H. Buch* vol. VII, II, 2, p. 1028.

⁵⁵ Dialogue, cap. I. A. Harnack, *Judentum und Judenchristentum in Justins Dialog mit Trypho*, *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur* XXXIX (1913), p. 53.

⁵⁶ On date of formation of province see Marq. *St. V.* I, p. 424. Harter, *Studies in Syria*, p. 87 ff.

⁵⁷ *Verfassung* II, p. 190, n. 1583.

⁵⁸ *St. V.* I, p. 423, n. 5.

phoenicia as a geographical term with no political significance, had been extended to include the region of Damascus by the time the Dialogue was written. No such suggestion would ever have been made if this passage was not in the Dialogue. There is no other evidence at all to support it. On the contrary there is good evidence against it. Strabo,⁵⁹ an important geographer of the time of Augustus, assigns Damascus to Syria Coele. Pomponius Mela,⁶⁰ of the first century A.D., mentions Damascene as a separate region of Syria, along with Coele, Phoenice, and others. Pliny, the Elder,⁶¹ similarly speaks of Damascena among the regions of Syria. In another passage⁶² he mentions Damascus as a city of the Decapolis of Syria. It is especially noteworthy that Ptolemaeus,⁶³ who was a contemporary of Justin Martyr, in his great work on geography lists Damascus as a city of Syria Coele. Apart from this evidence entirely it does not seem probable that the term Phoenice would be extended from the coast region so far over the original Syria Coele⁶⁴ to a region separated from it by two mountain ranges.

The difficulty may be explained in another way if we assume that Justin was mistaken in his geography, and assigned Damascus to the old coast region of Phoenice, which may well have had the compound name Syrophoenicia. In fact it is found in adjectival form in Mark VII, 26.⁶⁵ This explanation however can hardly be correct. Justin was a highly educated man, and as he was besides a native of a neighboring region, Samaria, it is not likely that he made such an error. Damascus was a well-known city, and of its situation Justin evidently knew something in claiming it as a city of Arabia.

Again, the anachronism would be explained if it could be shown that the Dialogue was not written by Justin, but by some other after the formation of the province of Syria Phoenice in 194. The suggestion that the Dialogue is not Justin's has been put forward by G. Krüger,⁶⁶ on the ground that Justin in his Apology does not seem to have had as complete a text before him, in quoting a passage of Genesis, as the author of the Dialogue had. This explanation

⁵⁹ XVI, 2, 20-22.

⁶⁰ I, 11.

⁶¹ N. H. V, 66.

⁶² V, 74.

⁶³ V, 15.

⁶⁴ Joseph. Ant. XIV, 3.

⁶⁵ Cf. Acts XXI, 2 and 3 where Syria and Phoenicia are used interchangeably of the coast region; Lucian, *Deorum concilium* 4; Juvenal, *Sat.* VIII, 159-160; Lucilius l. 497 ed. Fr. Marx.

⁶⁶ *Zschr. für d. N. T. Wissenschaft* VII (1906), p. 138-139.

however can hardly be accepted in the face of good evidence to the contrary. In cap. CXX of the Dialogue, the author cites Justin's Apology in a way that shows plainly that it is his own work. Eusebius⁶⁷ mentions the Dialogue among the works of Justin, and modern scholarship has found no reason to doubt it.⁶⁸

The problem is more simply and naturally solved by supposing that the particular statement was not written by Justin, as it now stands in the Dialogue, rather than that the whole work is of different authorship. This explanation in fact alone remains as possible, if the others are now all shown to be untenable. The manuscripts do not give much help. There are but two of them, one a copy of the other, and the older one written in 1364.⁶⁹ For this present problem it is of interest to note that the latest editor of the Dialogue, G. Archambault, states that the text is to be emended only by conjectures based in part on historical probabilities.⁷⁰

Now it is possible to show with a fair degree of probability how this textual error could have crept in. A section of Tertullian *Adv. Marc.* III, 13, which was written soon after 207 A.D.,⁷¹ contains the statement—*et Damascus Arabiae retro deputabatur, antequam transcripta esset in Syrophoenicen ex distinctione Syriarum.*⁷² The section in which this passage is found is based on Justin's Dialogue;⁷³ but it cannot be claimed that this passage is a copy in its entirety. The statement that Damascus "was transferred to Syrophoenicia on the division of the Syrias" simply notes an historical event which took place some fifteen years before the date of Tertullian's work; but it is not based on Justin, and could not be, for the province was divided long after Justin's death. It is quite possible however that some one, studying the subject presented in both writers, jotted down in Justin a marginal note from Tertullian's statement. When such a note might have been written it is hard to tell. It may be suggested that if the *νν* in the passage of the Dialogue could be read as part of the note it would seem very probable that it was written in Roman times before the rearrangement of the provinces in the fourth century. But this is uncertain, and of little importance

⁶⁷ *H. E.* IV, 18, 6.

⁶⁸ New Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopedia* VI, p. 282. Christ, *op. cit.*, p. 1030.

⁶⁹ Archamb. introd. p. XIV ff.

⁷⁰ Archamb. introd. p. XXXVIII.

⁷¹ Schanz, *Rom. Lit.* in Müller *H. Buch* VIII, 3, p. 324.

⁷² The passage is repeated in *Adv. Judaeos* cap. IX.

⁷³ Archamb. introd. p. LXII. Otto, *Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryphone*, vol. I, 2, p. 282, n. 23; and p. 596.

to the problem. The condition of the older of the two manuscripts of the Dialogue puts no difficulty in the way of believing that the note crept in from margin to text. It is considered a carelessly made copy of a manuscript which was itself poor.⁷⁴

As a reading of the phrase of Justin in question I would suggest: *ἐν καὶ νῦν προσενέμεται τῇ Συρίᾳ λεγομένη.*

The present of the participle *λεγομένη*—*quae vocatur*, in Latin⁷⁵—in the text looks suspicious. It is not essential to the passage. It is the kind of word a reader might have used in a marginal note. The Justin might have read simply *τῇ Συρίᾳ* in explanation of which a reader could easily have added from his Tertullian, *τῇ Συροφονίκῃ λεγομένη.* On the other hand Justin could have used it to emphasize his point that the land in which Damascus lay was really in Arabia. That land was now, under the Romans, merely called Syria. The possibility of this explanation makes me hesitate to remove the *λεγομένη.*

G. A. HARRER.

The University of North Carolina.

⁷⁴ Archamb. introd. p. XXXVI.

⁷⁵ Kühner, *Gramm. Gk. Str.* II, 1, p. 271, sect. 404.